

Zoning Commission

1 **Rezoning Application #ZON-17-09**

February 13, 2018

2
3 **Rezoning Application #ZON-17-09, CCBI Lewis Center LLC**, Requesting to rezone four (4) parcels
4 totaling 23.3 +/- acres from a Farm Residential (FR-1) District to a Single Family Planned Residential
5 (SFPRD) District to be known as the Lewis Center Ravine Condominium. The subject properties are
6 currently owned by CCBI Lewis Center LLC, Emily K. & Ralph Robert Reid Co Trustees, and Jack E. &
7 Brandy L. Weisenstein. The area being rezoned from FR-1 to SFPRD are located at 374, 390, 426 and
8 544 Lewis Center Road, Lewis Center OH 43035 having permanent parcel numbers 318-220-04-011-000,
9 318-220-04-010-000, 18-220-04-009-000 and 318-220-04-008-000.

10 Mr. Duell called the meeting for Rezoning Application #ZON-17-09 to order at 7:00 p.m.

11
12
13 Roll: Mark Duell, Christine Trebellas, Todd Dove, Katie Stenman, Roy Wilson

14
15 Township Officials Present: Michele Boni Planning & Zoning Director

16 MOTION TO RETURN FROM RECESS

17
18
19 Ms. Trebellas made a motion to return from recess for Rezoning Application #ZON-17-09, CCBI Lewis
20 Center, LLC; seconded by Mr. Wilson.

21
22 Vote on Motion: Mr. Duell-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes Mr. Dove-yes, Ms. Stenman-yes, Mr. Wilson-yes
23 Motion carried

24 APPLICANT PRESENTATION/COMMISSION QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

25
26
27 Mr. Duell: We have the new submission from the applicant.

28
29 Paul Cugini, 155 Green Meadows Drive South, Lewis Center.

30
31 Mr. Duell: Mr. Martin is not going to be here tonight, neither is Mr. McCarthy. I have spoken with Mr.
32 McCarthy, I know his comments. Is there anything you want to say about the new submission?

33
34 Mr. Cugini: Yes, but prefer the Commission to speak first off.

35
36 Mr. Duell: We have comments from Mr. McCarthy's review; these are the stipulations from the prior
37 meeting. Stipulation #1 was the technical language in the front, and the adjustment was made, so that was
38 taken care of. #2 was the elimination of the fuzzy language. Mr. McCarthy indicated he believes all
39 those were taken out, unless anyone has any comments on those. There was a request to include reference
40 to Exhibit H-6 in the Development Plan Text. Mr. McCarthy indicated there is a reference to the Munsell
41 Charts which is Exhibit H-6. The reference does not limit the permissible colors to the Munsell Charts,
42 so that is something that needs to be done. That will be a stipulation that carries over to the Trustees. #4
43 was clarify in the Development Text minimum side yard separation between all parts of all structures
44 shall be 10' and that there be no intrusion of any type into this area (example, roof overhangs, egress
45 windows, bay windows, bumpouts, etc.) and ensure that that result be reflected in the exhibits. Mr.
46 McCarthy indicated that language limiting intrusions into the 10' building separation was added on Page
47 16 of the Development Text in reply to Section 10.06 b)14) b, roof overhangs were not included, so any
48 concerns about roof overhangs not being on the list of things that can't fit into the 10'?

49
50 Ms. Trebellas: It won't meet the 10' separation with the roof overhang.

51

Zoning Commission

52 Mr. Duell: Need to get roof overhangs into the list of things that can't go into that 10'. 10' is 10' from
53 the whole thing, including the roof overhang. Is that going to be a problem?
54

55 Mr. Cugini: Typically the separations, even in the zoning or building process, it's always building to
56 building. An overhang hasn't been designed yet because some overhangs are 8", some 4", some 3".
57

58 Mr. Duell: I think the concern here is at 10', we've given you quite a bit of latitude from our community
59 standards in the Township. I think you can arrange the footprint to make 10' for everything.
60

61 Ms. Trebellas: Based on your diagram, if you do overhangs, you won't have soffit vents because it won't
62 meet the 10' separation. I assume you want soffit vents to ventilate your attic space or roof space.
63

64 Mr. Cugini: There are different methods of doing stuff like that.
65

66 Ms. Trebellas: Yes, there are different methods but I'm assuming soffit vents are the most expedient
67 method to use but you won't be able to use if you don't have the 10' separation according to your
68 lawyer's statement for your 10' separation. I don't want to get involved, but that's why I say 10' is 10'.
69

70 Mr. Cugini: A legal, technical definition of buildings is never measured from overhang to overhang; it's
71 always measured from foundation to foundation.
72

73 Mr. Duell: We're writing the rules for the district, so here we say straight up, 10'.
74

75 Ms. Trebellas: Our rules say you have to have 25', so maybe we'll just go back to 25' and call it a day.
76

77 Mr. Duell: So that's going to remain a stipulation; roof overhangs go back into the list. Our approval
78 will be conditioned on complying with the stipulations, and our stipulations are going to say 10' is 10'. In
79 the reply to Section 21.05 on Page 32 of the Development Text, provide that, in addition to the provisions
80 of that Section, all ponds and basins, whether retention, detention or otherwise, shall have a minimum
81 setback of 25' from the property lines. That was incorporated into the text. #6 on Page 11 of the
82 Development Plan Text, modify the reply to Section 10.06 b)4) to provide that direct lighting on the rear
83 of the structures on Locations 1-9 is not permitted. That language was incorporated into the response to
84 Section 10.06 b)4) on Page 11 together with the additional language prohibiting direct lighting on the
85 west side of Location 9, so that was addressed. #7, throughout the Development Plan Text, reinsert the
86 references to and regarding the building height divergence regarding walkouts reflected in the prior
87 submittal dated October 11, 2017. A stated request for a building height divergence was included in the
88 reply to Section 10.06 b)12) on Page 15. Additionally, other language addressing this comment was
89 added to replies to Section 10.06 b) 14 b and 10.06 b) 14 e on Page 16 of the Development Plan Text, and
90 Section 10.07 l) on Page 24 appears to be taken care of. That was an item of some discussion last time;
91 everybody OK with that?
92

93 Mr. Dove/Ms. Trebellas: Yes.
94

95 Mr. Duell: Consistent with the discussion at the January 10, 2018 hearing, modify the response to
96 Section 10.07 o) to provide that, if the Delaware County Engineer requires the wet pond/basin to rather be
97 a dry pond/basin, an amenity for residents of a similar quality and design will be submitted within that
98 maintained passive open space area for the current patio seating overlook with landscaping and benches.
99 The provisions were added for that. #9, consider reducing the maximum size of units. Mr. McCarthy is
100 indicating they might have actually increased rather than reduced.
101

Zoning Commission

102 Mr. Cugini: They changed all the units not to exceed the 2950 and left the units on the south side that are
103 walkout, potentially since they're walkout, they could potentially finish some lower level that would be
104 considered finished space and that's only Lots 1-9, the only ones that have walkouts.

105

106 Mr. Duell: You mean Locations 9-19?

107

108 Mr. Cugini: Yes. We kind of assume they could potentially do some type of lower level, not to exceed
109 3300.

110

111 Mr. Duell: Is everybody OK with that? Pretty big retirement home.

112

113 Mr. Cugini: If you have a walkout basement and you've got windows, if somebody comes in and wants
114 to do a game room for the grandkids or something down there, then you're stuck, you can't do it.

115

116 Mr. Dove: Because it was 3000, right?

117

118 Mr. Cugini: We reduced it to 2950.

119

120 Mr. Duell: Any comments? (None). #10, throughout the Development Plan Text (including but not
121 limited to the statement of divergences) and Exhibits, consistently provide that all buildings shall have a
122 minimum front setback of 19' from the edge of sidewalk or from the face of curb in those locations where
123 no sidewalk is required. On Page 10 of the Development Text it says the homes will be set back a
124 minimum of 19' from the face of curb or edge of sidewalk. Page 16 of the Development Text says the
125 front of the residences will be located so there is a minimum of 19' from the garage face to the edge of
126 sidewalk or from the face of curb in locations where there is no sidewalk, so there's potentially some
127 conflict here in that the latter only establishes a setback from the garage front and not the entire building.
128 The way that reads, there's no minimum front setback for the balance of the structure.

129

130 Ms. Trebellas: Which means the main part of your house could be all the way up to the sidewalk or the
131 curb. I don't think that was the intent.

132

133 Mr. Cugini: No, I don't think that was the intent.

134

135 Mr. Duell: I think it's just the way they wrote it, so we're going to leave that as a stipulation, and let Mr.
136 Martin and Mike work out the details.

137

138 Ms. Trebellas: Also, if you want parking spaces in front of your garage, they need to be 20' or you need a
139 variance to allow your parking space not to meet the Zoning Code of 20' deep but 19' deep. Is that
140 correct, Michele?

141

142 Ms. Boni: Yes, the minimum is 20' to have a parking space in your driveway.

143

144 Ms. Trebellas: If not, you won't meet the minimum number of parking spaces for each unit.

145

146 Ms. Boni: Unless you have a three car garage. You have to have 4 spaces per unit.

147

148 Mr. Duell: She wants a 20' driveway.

149

150 Ms. Trebellas: Or a variance to either not have the required number of parking spaces or to reduce the
151 size of the parking spaces.

152

Zoning Commission

153 Mr. Duell: 19' is pretty long for a car these days.

154

155 Ms. Trebellas: It depends on your car type, but other jurisdictions, 19', even 18' is considered a parking
156 space. In our jurisdiction, 20' is considered a parking space. I don't know how you want to resolve it,
157 but it needs to be clarified somehow or else your parking spaces will not meet Code.

158

159 Mr. Dove: The off street parking is also the 9' x 19' which then they'll be blocking the sidewalk because
160 the sidewalk dies into the parking spaces.

161

162 Ms. Trebellas: I don't think it was specified in the text what the size of those parking spaces was.

163

164 Mr. Dove: On one of the exhibits it says 9 x 20, but you're still cutting off the sidewalk. You have 19'
165 from edge of sidewalk but we have edge of curb where there's no sidewalk.

166

167 Ms. Boni: Could we make it a little more clear on what I'm looking for on that setback? Some areas we
168 have the setback from the garage, and some are from the front of the structure.

169

170 Mr. Duell: We'll say that no part of the structure may be closer than 19' and then the request here is that
171 the garage face should be no closer than 20'.

172

173 Ms. Trebellas: If you want your 4 parking spots or you have to ask for a variance to have 4 parking spots
174 or reduce the size of the parking spot.

175

176 Mr. Duell: Is that OK?

177

178 Mr. Cugini: Can I get ??

179

180 Ms. Trebellas: That's fine but it's just that if your parking spot is 19, it will not meet our Code and it's
181 just because our Code is 20; you're not the first developer that has run into this problem.

182

183 Ms. Boni: And that's in the text in Article XXI, where they provided on Page 30, it does say that they
184 will comply with that requirement for parking spaces.

185

186 Ms. Trebellas: And then as Todd brought up, not all of your off street parking spaces will comply if it
187 blocks the sidewalk. I don't know how that's calculated but technically it's from the edge of the sidewalk
188 so people can walk behind the car and don't have to go out in the street. You can bring that up with Mr.
189 Martin as well and how that one is to be resolved.

190

191 Mr. Duell: But they do say they will comply with the requirements, so....

192

193 Ms. Trebellas: Well it doesn't right now.

194

195 Mr. Duell: They'll have to. #11, adjust the language of the reply to Section 10.07 d) to conform to the
196 language of the response to Section 10.06 b) 2) regarding setbacks and buffering. To the extent of
197 overlap between the current responses to these Sections, they appear to correlate. However, in the reply
198 to Section 10.07 d), the lot depth of Locations 34 and 35 is unclear. And I think not only unclear but
199 unspecified.

200

201 Mr. Dove: 35 is going to be tough because it's on a curve; 34 looks like it starts to curve.

202

Zoning Commission

203 Mr. Duell: Section d) talks about the divergence for lot depth. If the lot depth complies, it complies,
204 otherwise it needs to be stated what it is. Any other comments on that?

205

206 Mr. Dove: No.

207

208 Ms. Trebellas: It's the curve.

209

210 Mr. Duell: I'll leave it as an open stipulation with regards to 34 and 35; confirm the lot depth of those
211 two. #12 on Page 22, state the maximum permitted lot coverage in Section 10.07 h). The reply to
212 Section 10.07 h), requested divergence did not state maximum permitted lot coverage. Site data of
213 Exhibit C-1 Development Plan indicates 25% maximum coverage, while the prior Utility Exhibit
214 indicated 29.18%. This should be clarified.

215

216 Mr. Cugini: I believe that also includes ??? and so forth,

217

218 Mr. Duell: We'll leave that as an open stipulation as well. On Page 29 of the Development Text, modify
219 the reply to Section 10.09 to state that a golf course is not permitted; that appears to be resolved on Page
220 30. #14, in the reply to Section 10.06 b) 12, include, with justification, the divergence requested from the
221 requirements of Section 21.03, structure separation. That is addressed on Page 15 of the Development
222 Text. Of course, with the structure separation, still need the overhangs. #15, relocate the reply to Section
223 21.05, water impoundments, to the appropriate section; that was relocated on Page 34. #16 was adjust the
224 discrepancy in the right-of-way width, indicate the various points in the Development Text to either 120'
225 or 80'. The right-of-way of Lewis Center Road is now universally reflected as being 80' rather than 120';
226 that's still correct?

227

228 Mr. Cugini: Yes, I believe the number has always been incorrect; from the plan. We'll just change the
229 incorrect number.

230

231 Mr. Duell: Exhibit E-1, Utility Exhibit, adjust the site data to conform to that reflected on Exhibit C-1
232 (Development Plan). Aside from the discrepancy regarding open space percentage, which is a minor typo
233 between the two; one says 58.76%, one says 58.67%, everything appears to conform. While not a big
234 change, I think we'll want to get that corrected just to be certain. #18, consider pursuing a divergence or
235 variance from the Fire Code provision prohibiting parking on one side of a private street having a 26'
236 pavement width. Applicant's commitment to seek a Fire Code variance allowing on-street parking on the
237 non-hydrant side of the streets is stated on Page 25 in the reply to Section 10.07 o).

238

239 Mr. Dove: When would that happen; before you get thru this process?

240

241 Mr. Cugini: Probably have to do it after. It would have to be in conjunction with the engineering because
242 we would have to have the engineering plans reviewed by the Fire Department.

243

244 Mr. Duell: Then Mr. McCarthy identified some additional items:

245

246 a) Notwithstanding Item 8 of the comments of December 8, 2017, the reply to Section 27.02 on page 1
247 of the development text still requires amendment to read: "The Owners and the Applicant are hereby
248 submitting this application for consideration of a zoning change to a Single Family Planned
249 Residential District (SFPRD)."

250

251 Mr. Cugini: That was done.

252

253 Mr. Duell: No, it still says; it needs to say a, so that will be one.

Zoning Commission

254 b) The applicant should ensure that a copy of the Fire Code provisions repeatedly referenced in the
255 Development Text as part of Exhibit H-4. Apparently the electronic version had everything but the
256 paper copy was missing some pages. Mr. Duell: For the Fire Code, I think no copy was present in
257 the plan although was accessible in the on-line version. Just want to make sure if we're referencing
258 it, it needs to be in the paper somewhere.

259
260 c) The applicant should ensure that copies of the additional materials accompanying Exhibit E-5 (Del-
261 Co Water Company correspondence) are included in the hard copy record set of the development
262 plan. No copies were present in the plan reviewed, although the on-line accessible version did
263 contain this. Mr. Duell: That's another thing; we're just missing the hard copies of this file.

264
265 d) While the 18' minimum structure setback indication on the Typical Configuration detail on Exhibit
266 C-1, Development Plan, has been deleted, the distance from the edge of sidewalk to Building
267 Envelope still scales at 18', rather than 19'.
268

269 Mr. Cugini: I think it states 19.

270

271 Ms. Trebellas: I think it will be resolved once that whole setback thing gets resolved.

272

273 Mr. Duell: He wasn't overly concerned about that one.

274

275 e) It should be noted that the applicant has arguably improved the western buffer depicted on Exhibit D-
276 1, Landscape Plan, by substituting some variety of heights (6', 8', 12') of Norway and Serbian Spruce
277 into the plantings in place of the prior 5'-6' heights indicated. Mr. Duell: Everyone OK with the
278 Landscape Plan?
279

280

281 Mr. Dove/Ms. Trebellas: Yes.

282

283 f) Conflict seems to exist between the text of the reply to Section 10.06 b) on page 22 of the
284 development text (and elsewhere) as to all classes of open space and total open space, (e.g., indicating
285 12.99 acres of total open space) and the indications on the Illustrative Plan, Exhibit C-1 -
286 Development Plan, and Exhibit D-4 - Open Space Plan, (e.g., all of which indicate a total of 13.69
287 acres of total open space). Mr. Duell: I think we just need to get everything to agree.

288

289 g) It should be noted that Exhibit E-1 - Utility Exhibit still reflects a label stating "Potential Path if
290 Required by Township." Mr. Duell: We've already got paths and sidewalks, you could probably
291 eliminate it, although if it says it, I don't really care at this point. To make it a stipulation is probably
292 going to be unnecessary.

293

294 Ms. Trebellas: I didn't think we really had control over Parks per se anyway.

295

296 Mr. Duell: If they want to put it on there, that's fine. Don't worry about it, just "x" it out. Were there
297 any other comments?

298

299 Mr. Dove: I wasn't here at the last meeting when we went thru the stipulations. We had a stipulation that
300 talked about reducing the gross density in this development to 2 units per acre, and I don't mean to open a
301 can of worms, but I know there was probably a discussion about that. Has the Commission just kind of
302 said it is what it is or where were we on that? They considered it and we're still at 2.36?

Zoning Commission

303 Mr. Duell: I think we considered a number of factors, one was preservation of the natural features to the
304 south of the property, one was reference to a section of Code that permits greater density when greater
305 density is adjacent to the property, and we have that development across the street.

306
307 Mr. Dove: My concern with the density still, is the 12.99 acres pretty much the area that's not being
308 developed?

309
310 Mr. Cugini: I don't know the exact number but it's 12 or 13.

311
312 Mr. Dove: It's roughly 13. So we have about 10.31 buildable acres that we're putting 55 units plus a
313 clubhouse, so we'll call it 56 units. We have a property across the street that was approved at 4.20 that
314 everyone I ever talk to complains about and now we're building a development with about 5.33 units per
315 buildable acre, so we've got a bigger density on this that you're building than we do across the street.

316
317 Mr. Cugini: The only difference is across the street, I believe you're looking at buildable and not total
318 area, so there may be a skew there.

319
320 Mr. Dove: But the people driving down Lewis Center aren't going to be looking thru all these houses at
321 the pretty ravines behind it. They're going to, just like when we go to Kroger and we all drive by that
322 other property and go, how did that happen? The development is what it is, but I'm just expressing my
323 concern that we're allowing higher density of the buildable area than the development across the street
324 that people aren't happy that it happened. You're trying to do cluster homes, which I understand, but the
325 cluster homes still says you need to meet the requirements of the density of single family, and we're not
326 doing that. We're pretty much not doing anything in the Code, and I know again we don't have a zoning
327 for this type of product, but everything that we're trying to sell and follow, we're not following.

328
329 Mr. Duell: As much as you do not like what's across the street, the Code does essentially give them the
330 OK because of the density.

331
332 Mr. Dove: It's adjacent to across the street, but I don't know that it's....

333
334 Ms. Trebellas: The Code says adjacency to pre-existing developments. In regard to a Single Family
335 Planned Residential District development within Orange Township which is located contiguous to or
336 directly across the street from an existing single family residential project....

337
338 Ms. Stenman: This isn't a single family residential project.

339
340 Ms. Trebellas: It is across the street, so that answers your question, Todd?

341
342 Mr. Dove: But it's a multi-family.

343
344 Ms. Trebellas: But the one across the street is multi-family, not single family, so it's not quite apples to
345 apples comparison; you're comparing a single family project to a multi-family project.

346
347 Mr. Dove: We all have our opinions on it and it is what it is; it's not going to change to what's in our
348 Code, so that's my opinion. Are you really anticipating that it's going to be a 5 year project? I know it's
349 what the industry requires, but it's 2 years to put in the roads and infrastructure and then the first phase is
350 another couple more years.

351
352 Mr. Cugini: It will probably be a year by the time the roads are in, then 2-2-1/2 years for Phase 1 and 2;
353 it's just worst case scenario.

Zoning Commission

354 Mr. Duell: Because Mr. McCarthy is not here, we don't have a motion, so I'm proposing that we have the
355 vote at our next regularly scheduled meeting. There are already 2 other items on that agenda but my
356 thought is that we would just do the motion and vote, so any discussion I would like to get completed
357 tonight, so if you've got concerns about anything, please now because we're not really going to have time
358 next time to go over it.

359
360 Ms. Trebellas: I know earlier there was lighting and you removed it based on our Code, but I wasn't clear
361 about the clubhouse. I know it has exterior lights on the back of the building, but is there lighting by the
362 pool?

363
364 Mr. Cugini: No.

365
366 Ms. Trebellas: That wasn't clear in the text and some places do have lighting by the pool. I was just
367 concerned that the neighbors might complain if there's lighting.

368
369 Mr. Cugini: It's not a night pool.

370
371 Ms. Trebellas: That needs to be clarified. I know Mr. McCarthy brought up the whole building code
372 issue and in the text there wasn't reference to the building code but there was a typical law section. I
373 don't know if you've seen this or not, if you're familiar with that, but I don't know if that's actually what
374 you're going to build, so you might just want to review that before the final document is put together
375 before the Commission.

376
377 Mr. Duell: This is the last document we're going to see; the next one goes to the Trustees.

378
379 Ms. Trebellas: Mike wanted that Code in the document.

380
381 Mr. Duell: These are going to be the stipulations in the motion to the Trustees.

382
383 Mr. Dove: On Page 22, Sub-section C, Lot Widths, where it talks about location lot depth divergences.
384 "There should be a minimum of 52 feet between the center points of side yards on each side of the
385 condominium residence". I'm assuming that's 5'; the foot symbol turned into a 2.

386
387 Ms. Boni: On January 28, 2018, we received a letter from an abutting neighbor, Melissa and John
388 Edwards, and they were concerned with the mound proposed at the fence, and I believe the applicant has
389 addressed that concern by removing the fence. Is that correct?

390
391 Mr. Cugini: Well, reversing the fence and the trees.

392
393 Mr. Duell: Todd, you're saying the sentence there will be a minimum of 52 feet between the center
394 points of the side yards should be 5 feet?

395
396 Mr. Dove: I believe so.

397
398 Ms. Trebellas: I have that circled but I was a little confused as to what they meant by 52 feet.

399
400 Mr. Dove: It's 10' between and they're saying it's a minimum of 5' between the center points of the side
401 yard.

402
403 Ms. Trebellas: I would have Mr. Martin talk to Mr. McCarthy and try to figure out exactly what was
404 meant by that.

Zoning Commission

405 Mr. Duell: One can't be 10 and one can't be right on the line. I'll make a note of it for Mr. McCarthy to
406 include if that is indeed what it should be.

407

408 Mr. Cugini: I just want to make sure I've got this, we're talking about Comment Numbers 3, 4, 10, 11,
409 12, 17, additional items, we'll make sure we've got those.

410

411 Mr. Duell: That would be a, b, c and f and then the one additional one on Page 22.

412

413 Mr. Cugini: And that will be on the 27th; I'll be out of town.

414

415 Mr. Duell: As of right now we don't know if Mr. Martin will be able to attend and Mr. Cugini won't be
416 here, so if you have any questions, I can't stress enough, please ask them now. Any other comments from
417 the residents?

418

419

PUBLIC COMMENT

420

421 Audience member: With this amount of density, you're setting a precedent that you've got to be very
422 careful with. Like Mr. Dove said, you're driving down Lewis Center Road and all you're seeing is this.
423 Forget the woods and the creek behind it, and you're setting a precedent that can come into play again in
424 the near future, I'm sure, so just be careful with that, as I'm sure you will be.

425

426 Mr. Duell: We have had other developments that are higher and we basically rejected them. This one is
427 down, in my estimation, closer to where we want to be. It's not perfect.

428

429 Audience member: It's not close enough. It's similar to what was going on on Old State Road that you
430 guys didn't turn down, density wise. It's just that you're setting a precedent that you've got to be careful
431 with.

432

433 Mr. Duell: We'll do the motion and the vote on the 27th.

434

MOTION TO RECESS APPLICATION #ZON-17-09

435

436
437 Mr. Dove made a motion to recess Application #ZON-17-09, CCBI Lewis Center LLC, until Tuesday,
438 February 27, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Orange Township Hall; seconded by Ms. Stenman

439 Vote on Motion: Mr. Duell-yes, Ms. Trebellas-yes, Mr. Dove-yes, Ms. Stenman-yes, Mr. Wilson-yes
440 Motion carried

441

442 Mr. Duell: Either way, however the Commission votes, this will go to the Trustees, and they don't have
443 to follow any recommendation from us, up or down. It will definitely go after that night.

444

445 Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

446

447 On April 24, 2018, Ms. Stenman moved to approve the meeting minutes of the Orange Township Zoning
448 Commission dated February 13, 2018, for Rezoning Application #ZON-17-09, CC BI Lewis Center, as
449 written; seconded by Mr. McNulty.

450

451 Vote on Motion: Mr. Duell-yes, Ms. Stenman-yes, Ms. Ault-yes, Mr. McNulty-yes

452